

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

601 Thirteenth Street N.W.
Washington, DC 20005

Telephone
202 783-5070

Facsimile
202 783-2331

Web Site
www.fr.com

Frederick P. Fish
1855-1930

W.K. Richardson
1859-1951

December 29, 1998

By Hand Delivery

Ms. Magalie Roman Salas
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
The Portals TW-A325
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Re: 1998 Biennial Regulatory Review -- Amendment of Part 18 of the
Commission's Rules to Update Regulations for RF Lighting Devices
ET Docket No. 98-42

Dear Ms. Salas:

Pursuant to Section 1.1206(a)(2) of the Commission's Rules, and on behalf of
Fusion Lighting Corporation, this letter is to report oral and written ex parte
communications in the above-reference proceeding.

On December 29, 1998, Michael Ury of Fusion Lighting and I met with Paul
Misener of Commissioner Furchtgott-Roth's office and later with Peter A. Tenhula
of Commissioner Powell's office.

The purpose of these meetings were to provide rebuttal evidence to materials
provided by various Part 15 device manufacturers on the theoretical in-band
interference issues associated with 2.45 GHz RF lighting. Information presented at
the meeting is enclosed herewith.

Very truly yours,



Terry G. Mahn

/seg
Enclosure/Original & Copy

cc: Mitchell Lazarus [w/encl.]
Michael Ury, Fusion Lighting [w/o encl.]
Ellen Ranard, Esq., Fusion Lighting [w/o encl.]
James E. Proctor, Fusion Lighting [w/o encl.]

No. of Copies rec'd 0+1
List ABCDE

93929.W11

BOSTON
NEW YORK
SILICON VALLEY
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
TWIN CITIES
WASHINGTON, DC

MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT 2.45 GHz RF LIGHTING IN *EX PARTE* FILING OF WIRELESS LAN MANUFACTURERS DOCKET ET 98-42

"RF Lighting Proponents Have Declined or Refused to Share Data"

- Fusion Lighting is under no legal or regulatory obligation to test for in-band emissions
- Fusion was never asked by wireless LAN manufacturers for in-band test data; Fusion was asked, on short notice, to do joint testing
- Fusion products have been available on the market for several years for LAN manufacturers to test
- Fusion provided the FCC Labs with a sample RF lighting device in 1996 that was tested for in-band emissions

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
DEC 29 1998

RECEIVED

MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT 2.45 GHz RF LIGHTING IN *EX PARTE* FILING OF WIRELESS LAN MANUFACTURERS DOCKET ET 98-42

"Severe and Widespread Interference Will Occur From RF Lighting"

- *Ex Parte* data was based on worst case RF safety limits which have no applicability to RF interference
- *Ex Parte* data assumed 8 watts of radiation; in fact, the Fusion Lamp radiates only 50 milliwatts
- Fusion lamps sold in Europe are 20 dB below IEC/CISPR Publication 15 limits for ISM band lighting (100 dBuV/m)
- Fusion lamps are CE-marked and have been on EU market for several years with no reports of interference

MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT 2.45 GHz RF LIGHTING IN *EX PARTE* FILING OF WIRELESS LAN MANUFACTURERS DOCKET ET 98-42

***Ex Parte* Proposal Will "Shield 98% of Emissions Passing 95% of Light
for Pennies Per Unit"**

- Proposal implies Fusion is an uncaring RF designer
- Projected RF attenuation (98%) is a theoretical value that assumes perfect conductivity of the wire mesh
- Proposal assumes a wire diameter of .003"; no known wire of such dimension can be fabricated from a material with perfect conductivity at 2.45 GHz -- certainly not at "pennies per unit"

MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT 2.45 GHz RF LIGHTING IN *EX PARTE* FILING OF WIRELESS LAN MANUFACTURERS DOCKET ET 98-42

Proposal Will "Shield 98% of Emissions Passing 95% of Light for Pennies Per Unit"

- Fusion invests considerable resources in RF shielding on the assumption that any lamp which causes interference to a 2.45 GHz LAN systems will be refused installation or returned by the customer
- Fusion already implements a secondary RF shield in the cover glass on all of its lamps which outperforms the proposed solution both optically and in terms of RF attenuation
- Fusion's RF shield costs \$12 per lamp

**MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT 2.45 GHz RF
LIGHTING IN *EX PARTE* FILING OF
WIRELESS LAN MANUFACTURERS
DOCKET ET 98-42**

**"Allowing RF Lighting to Proliferate in U.S. Without In-Band Limits
Effectively Disrupts International Usage of the 2.45 GHz Band"**

- The 2.45 GHz band is harmonized internationally for ISM priority
- Unlicensed use of the 2.45 GHz band for LAN devices is non-harmonized outside the U.S.

**MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT 2.45 GHz RF
LIGHTING IN *EX PARTE* FILING OF
WIRELESS LAN MANUFACTURERS
DOCKET ET 98-42**

**"Other Part 18 Devices Are Used Individually Whereas Lighting Devices
Are Installed In Multiple Units Per Site"**

- Microwave ovens are installed in multiple units per site in tens of thousands of restaurant and food outlets throughout the world

**MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT 2.45 GHz RF
LIGHTING IN *EX PARTE* FILING OF
WIRELESS LAN MANUFACTURERS
DOCKET ET 98-42**

**"FCC Requested Comments on Whether It May Be Necessary To
Establish In-Band Limits"**

- Docket 98-42 requested comment ONLY on licensed services (MSS) in the upper portion of the 2.45 GHz band
- Docket 98-42 invited no comment on Part 15 interference issues

MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT 2.45 GHz RF LIGHTING IN *EX PARTE* FILING OF WIRELESS LAN MANUFACTURERS DOCKET ET 98-42

"FCC Invited The Part 15 Industry To Develop Equipment Using The 2.45 GHz ISM Band"

- In 1985 (Docket 81-413 - spread spectrum), the FCC refused to adopt higher limits for Part 15 because of the "danger" that:

"steady encroachment on [the ISM] bands by [such] services will eventually lead to petitions from these other users for protection from interference from ISM devices."

MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT 2.45 GHz RF LIGHTING IN *EX PARTE* FILING OF WIRELESS LAN MANUFACTURERS DOCKET ET 98-42

"FCC Should Consider Input on Part 15 Spread Spectrum Devices When Authorizing New Types of Part 18 Devices"

- In 1997 (Docket 96-8 - spread spectrum) the FCC stated:

The manufacturers and operators of spread spectrum transmitters are reminded that the operation of Part 15 devices is subject to the conditions that any received interference, including interference from ISM operations, must be accepted and that harmful interference may not be cause to other radio services.